



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/841,023 | 04/25/2001 | Takanobu Otsubo | 046601-5090 | 6182 |

9629 7590 10/04/2005
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

RUDOLPH, VINCENT M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/841,023 | OTSUBO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Vincent Rudolph | 2624 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 and 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sato ('691).

Regarding claim 1, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller within an image processing system (See Figure 1, Element 102), used for recognizing a specific image within the input data (See Figure 7; Col. 8, Line 13-21). The system executes a determination unit, such as the raster image processing, and sees if a raster image exists within the image data (See Col. 7, Line 19-23). A recognition unit, within the image processing system, is used to recognize the specific image, such as a detection of a mark attached to the image, in the raster image outputted from the determination unit (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Regarding claim 2, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller (See Figure 1, Element 102), used for recognizing a specific image within the input data (See Figure 7; Col. 8, Line 13-21). The system has a recognition unit, which is used to recognize the specific image (See Col. 7, Line 27-34). It also has a determination unit to tell whether the image data includes a predetermined characteristic, such as a mark to indicate its copyright (See Col. 7, Line 31-34). It then commands the recognition unit within the image processing system to recognize that specific image if the predetermined characteristic is included (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Regarding claim 3, Sato ('691) discloses the determination unit determines whether the raster image within the image data includes the predetermined characteristic or not (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Regarding claim 10, Sato ('691) discloses an output image data generation unit to generate and output the data (See Col. 7, Line 22-23). This unit temporarily stops, such as pausing while the process is going from one step to another, the generation or the output of the image data if the determination unit decides that the recognition unit is needed, such as if there is a detection mark, for processing the image data (See Col. 7, Line 24-34).

Regarding claim 11, Sato ('691) discloses an output image data generation unit to generate and output the data (See Col. 7, Line 22-23). This unit temporarily stops, such as pausing while the process is going from one step to another, the generation or output of the image data if the determination unit determines that the possibility of including a specific image in the image data is higher than a predetermined level, such

Art Unit: 2624

as either the mark being detected or not, as a result of the recognition unit processing, such as the likelihood that the specific image includes a mark and is copyrighted (See Col. 8, Line 9-21).

Regarding claim 12, Sato ('691) discloses an output image data generation unit to generate and output the data (See Col. 7, Line 22-23). The included determination unit executes processing for making determination on image data for every predetermined unit being processed, such as receiving the data and executing the raster image processing (See Col. 7, Line 19-23). The output image data generation unit also changes the quantity, for example from one page to zero, of the output image data if it is determined that the possibility of including the specific image, as a result of the recognition unit, in the image data is higher than a predetermined level, such as it a specific image within the image data has a mark and is copyrighted (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Regarding claim 13, Sato ('691) discloses the output image data generation unit stops the generation or output of the image data if the recognition unit detects the existence of the specific image (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Regarding claim 14, Sato ('691) discloses the output image data generation unit outputs fixed data, such converting the image data all into a blank page, as the output image data if the recognition unit detects the specific image (See Col. 10, Line 1-9).

Regarding claim 15, Sato ('691) discloses the output image data generation unit outputs a character string informing that the existence of the specific image is

Art Unit: 2624

recognized (a warning display on the host computer, Col. 10, Line 1-6) if the recognition unit detects the specific image.

Regarding claim 16, Sato ('691) discloses an output image data generation unit to generate and output the data (See Col. 7, Line 22-23). This unit stops the generation or output of the image data if the recognition unit detects the existence of the specific image, or a detection mark attached to the image (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Regarding claim 17, Sato ('691) discloses that the determination unit determines a mode, such as printing, for generating the output image data and commands the recognition unit to execute the recognition processing if it is a predetermined mode (See Col. 7, Line 19-34).

Regarding claim 18, Sato ('691) discloses the determination unit receives processing in units of page (See Col. 7, Line 19-21).

Regarding claim 19, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller (See Figure 1, Element 102), used for recognizing a specific image within the input data (See Col. 6, Line 38-44). The system has a recognition unit, which is used to recognize the specific image (See Col. 7, Line 28-35). It also has a determination unit to decide a mode, such as printing, for outputting the image data and commands the recognition unit to execute the recognition processing if it is a predetermined mode (See Col. 7, Line 19-34).

Regarding claim 20, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller within an image processing system (See Figure 1, Element 102), that generates output image data based on the input image data (See Col. 7, Line 19-26)

Art Unit: 2624

and then outputs it to a device, such as an image forming device (See Figure 1, Element 103) provided with a function for recognizing a specific image (See Col. 8, Line 13-21). This includes a determination unit that determines whether the image data includes the predetermined characteristic (See Col. 7, Line 27-34). It also has an output image data generation unit that generates the output image data based upon the input image data and outputs it with added information, such as a warning display on the host computer (See Figure 8A and 8B), that there is a possibility of including the specific image in the output image data if the determination unit determines the input image data includes the predetermined characteristic (See Col. 7, Line 35-45). It also converts the image data into a blank image and outputs it (See Col. 10, Line 1-9).

Regarding claim 21, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller (See Figure 1, Element 102), used for recognizing a specific image within the input data (See Col. 6, Line 38-44). The system has a recognition unit, such as the product information, is used to recognize the specific image (See Col. 8, Line 13-21). It also has a determination unit for determining whether or not information, such as a detection mark, possibly exists in the specific image in the image data and commands the recognition unit to execute the recognition processing if this information exists or is detected (See Col. 7, Line 27-45).

Regarding claim 22, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the image processor of claim 1 corresponds to the computer-readable storage medium (See Col. 6, Line 37-40) of claim 22 and performs the steps disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato ('691).

Regarding claim 4, Sato ('691) discloses the determination unit determines whether several or plural raster images are continuous, or able to continue the printing process, if the raster images exist in the data, which is determined by their predetermined characteristic as one raster image, or mark to indicate its copyright (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Sato ('691) does not disclose whether or not the raster images exist determined as being continuous have the predetermined characteristic as one raster image.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have a page of a document contains plural images if the user desires to include it. So, if any of the images contained within the document have the predetermined characteristic, the determination unit determines if the plural raster images are continuous.

Claim 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato ('691) in view of Microsoft Windows NT/95/98.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 5, Sato ('691) discloses a determination unit for determining whether the raster image within the image data includes the predetermined characteristic or not (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Sato ('691) does not disclose that the size of the output raster image is used as a predetermined characteristic.

Microsoft Windows NT/95/98 discloses a feature where the size of a file and other attributes, such as the file name, can be entered to find the results (See Page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the size of a file, such as the raster image, disclosed by Microsoft Windows NT/95/98 and incorporate it into the image processing system of Sato ('691) because it helps the user find the specific file desired and determine if the image meets the predetermined characteristic.

Thus, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato ('691) in view of Kadowaki ('038).

Regarding claim 6, Sato ('691) discloses a determination unit for determining whether the raster image within the image data includes the predetermined characteristic or not (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Sato ('691) does not disclose that the resolution of the raster image is used as a predetermined characteristic.

Art Unit: 2624

Kadowaki ('038) discloses one of the parameters for the raster image data is the size, which comprises of the resolution, of the raster image in the x and y direction (See Col. 5, Line 53-54), such as 1024x768, for making the determination of the image.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the resolution of the raster image data disclosed by Kadowaki ('038) and incorporate it into the image processing system of Sato ('691) because it helps determine the image parameters when judging whether it meets the predetermined characteristic.

Thus, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Regarding claim 7, Sato ('691) discloses a determination unit for determining whether the raster image within the image data includes the predetermined characteristic or not (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Sato ('691) does not disclose that the number of colors of the raster image is used as a predetermined characteristic.

Kadowaki ('038) discloses one of the predetermined parameters for determining a raster image data is the number of colors component (See Col. 5, Line 46-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the number of colors of the raster image data disclosed by Kadowaki ('038) and incorporate it into the image processing system of Sato ('691) because it helps determine the image parameters when judging whether it meets the predetermined characteristic.

Thus, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Regarding claim 8, Sato ('691) discloses a determination unit for determining whether the raster image within the image data includes the predetermined characteristic or not (See Col. 7, Line 27-34).

Sato ('691) does not disclose using a compression format of the output raster image is used as a predetermined characteristic.

Kadowaki ('038) discloses one of the predetermined parameters for determining a raster image data is the compression format of the raster image, which is used as the image type of the raster image (See Col. 5, Line 46) and includes compression formats such as JPEG, GIF, BMP, etc.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the compression format of the raster image data disclosed by Kadowaki ('038) and incorporate it into the image processing system of Sato ('691) because it helps determine the image parameters when judging whether it meets the predetermined characteristic.

Thus, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato ('691) in view of Shah (Pub. # 20020085756).

Regarding claim 9, Sato ('691) discloses an image processor, such as a print controller (See Figure 1, Element 102), used for recognizing a specific image within the input data (See Col. 8, Line 13-21). The system has a recognition unit, which is used to recognize the specific image (See Col. 7, Line 27-34). It also has a determination unit, which commands the recognition unit within the image processing system to recognize

a specific image if the predetermined characteristic, such as the detection mark attached to the image, is included (See Col. 7, Line 35-45).

Sato ('691) does not disclose that the recognition unit executes processing at a lower resolution of output, determines the result, and commands again the recognition unit to execute the processing at a higher resolution if the possibility of including the specific image in the image data is higher than a predetermined level.

Shah (Pub. # 20020085756) discloses a recognition engine (See Figure 2, Element 216) that uses character recognition to recognize the lower resolution version of the image and determines the confidence level of the result. If this has a high confidence level, the higher resolution of the image is then processed (See Page 1, Paragraph 0008; Page 3, Paragraph 0028).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have resolution recognition processing disclosed by Shah (Pub. # 20020085756) and incorporate it into the image processing system of Sato ('691) because it optimally sets the initial conditions of an optical recognition without significantly adding time to the recognition.

Thus, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is: Murakawa ('432) and Yanagita ('013).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent Rudolph whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 2624

8243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 A.M. - 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vincent Rudolph
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Zimmerman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600